

NOTES MODERN BIBLE VERSIONS

Origen was a heretic and Gnostic and along with Clement of Alexandria helped to corrupt the manuscripts giving us the false versions of today. Here are some of Adamantius Origen's beliefs. When he taught, he wore the pagan robes of the pagan philosopher plus he castrated himself based on his Gnostic views of the evil of the flesh.

- 1) He believed the Holy Spirit was a feminine force.
- 2) He believed in Soul Sleep
- 3) He was a very strong proponent of Baptismal regeneration
- 4) He believed that Jesus was only a created being and Gnosticism taught that Jesus became Christ at his baptism but that he was never God. He was a just a good man with very high morals.
- 5) He believed in the doctrine of Purgatory
- 6) He believed in transubstantiation
- 7) He believed in the transmigration of the soul and reincarnation of the soul.
- 8) He doubted the temptations of Jesus in Scripture and claimed they could have never happened.
- 9) The Scriptures were not literal. He was the father of allegory.
- 10) Genesis 1-3 was a myth, not historical or literal, as there was no actual person named "Adam."
- 11) Based upon Matthew 19, a true man of God should be castrated, which he did to himself.
- 12) He taught eternal life was not a gift, instead one must grab hold of it and retain it.
- 13) Christ enters no man until they mentally grasp the understanding of the consummation of the ages. (It was Frederick Dennison Maurice in the 19th century who defined eternal life as coming to a knowledge of God. This is the essence of Gnosticism.)
- 14) He taught there would be no physical resurrection of the believers.

Constantine's first edict in 331 AD. was to have fifty Bibles made up so he called on a man named Eusebius. Eusebius was mightily influenced by the teachings of Origen which resulted in him believing the same way, which means he was not a Christian. Eusebius had a good opportunity to use the pure manuscripts from Antioch but instead he chose the corrupted texts from Alexandria and thus the foundation for the modern bibles were formed. He used the fifth column in Origen's Hexapla. It is strongly believed in both camps that the foundational texts for the modern bibles, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts, were two of the original fifty bibles that Eusebius made up. However, there is no specific evidence for this

since both the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus differ from each other in over 3,000 places in the Gospels alone, which in my mind, would tell me that they could not have been made by the same scribes from the same manuscripts at the same time. If they were copied from the same manuscripts, there would not be that much divergence.

The Vaticanus Manuscript (B)

The word “Vatican” in Latin means “Hill of Divination.” (Deu 18:10 KJV) There shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, The Vaticanus manuscript was found in the Vatican library in 1481. It was rejected by the King James Translators because it was very corrupt and unreliable. The following portions of Scripture are missing from the Vaticanus: Genesis 1:1-46; 28; Psalms 106-138; Matthew 16:2-3; Mark 16:9-20; The Pastoral Epistles (1 & 2 Timothy and Titus) and everything after Hebrews 9:14. These were intentional omissions because the manuscript was found in excellent condition with no pieces missing. In the Gospels it leaves out 237 words, 452 clauses, and 748 whole sentences. These omissions were intentional since there was room left on pages to write these in. The Vaticanus manuscript was written on expensive Vellum and was in good condition when found which means that the missing areas were not due to missing sections but intentional omission.

The Sinaiticus Manuscript (a) Aleph

The major characteristic of this manuscript is that it is a literary mess. There are mistakes, erasures, sentences written on top of other sentences plus many words are omitted. It contains nearly all the New Testament, the Apocryphal Books plus two other false books, “The Shepherd of Hermes” and “The Epistle of Barnabas.” Every page contains corrections and revisions by at least ten different people. Corrections on the manuscript were made as late as the sixth or seventh century A.D. With so many revisions and corrections done to this manuscript, it made it totally worthless. It was found in a garbage can in St. Catherine’s Monastery in 1844 by Constantine Tischendorf. The manuscript was so bad, the monks were going to burn the manuscript just for heat. It too omits Mark 16:9-20.

Constantine’s first edict in 331 AD. was to have fifty Bibles made up so he called on a man named Eusebius. Eusebius was mightily influenced by the teachings of Origen which resulted in him believing the same way, which means he was not a Christian. Eusebius had a good opportunity to use the pure manuscripts from Antioch but instead he chose the corrupted texts from Alexandria and thus the

foundation for the modern bibles were formed. He used the fifth column in Origen's Hexapla. It is strongly believed in both camps that the foundational texts for the modern bibles, the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus manuscripts, were two of the original fifty bibles that Eusebius made up. However, there is no specific evidence for this since both the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus differ from each other in over 3,000 places in the Gospels alone, which in my mind, would tell me that they could not have been made by the same scribes from the same manuscripts at the same time. If they were copied from the same manuscripts, there would not be that much divergence.

Here is what NIV translator Ralph Earle wrote about the two Alexandrian manuscripts:

Soon after the middle of the nineteenth century (1859), N. Tischendorf discovered in the monastery of Saint Catherine on Mount Sinai a fourth-century uncial manuscript of the entire New Testament, together with much of the Old Testament in Greek translation. From its place of discovery, it is called Codex **Sinaiticus**. ("Codex" means a bound book, in distinction from a scroll.) Soon after that he pressured authorities into making another fourth century manuscript available to scholars. It is called the Codex **Vaticanus**, because it is held in the Vatican library at Rome. Codex Sinaiticus is now in the British Museum.

These two great fourth-century uncials agree rather closely with the third century papyri [see below]. This provides us with a more accurate Greek text of the New Testament than that found in the Textus Receptus, which is based primarily on late minuscules. We should be grateful to God for making these early manuscripts available to us as the basis for an up-to-date, contemporary translation of an ancient text.

(From The NIV: The Making of a Contemporary Translation, Edited by Kenneth Barker, pp 56,57, online ed.
<http://www.gospelcom.net/ibs/niv/mct/> Emphasis Added.)

The "third century papyri" referred to are "two copies of John's Gospel (Papyri 66 and 75) from about A.D. 200" (p 56). (So you see that since these four older manuscripts disagree with the the Majority Text (the TR), and agree with each other, the scholars concluded that they are "more accurate")

Notice that last sentence: "We should be grateful to God for making these early manuscripts available to us as the **BASIS** for an up-to-

date, contemporary translation of an ancient text." Since Papyri 66 & 75 only contain the Gospel of John, they can not be used to translate any other book than John. Here you have it: NIV translator Ralph Earle admits that they used Sinaticus and Vaticanus as the basis for their NT translation (excluding the Gospel of John)!!!

Note the gushing words he uses for these manuscripts: "these two GREAT fourth-century uncials" and "We should be thankful to God for making these manuscripts available to us..."

Question #36

QUESTION: Do the Dead Sea Scrolls render the King James Bible obsolete?

ANSWER: No, they support it.

EXPLANATION: The Dead Sea Scrolls which were found by an Arab shepherd boy in 1947 in the Qumran caves near Jericho, Israel have no ill effect on the Bible.

Their text **actually** agrees with the King James Bible. This fact makes them unattractive to scholars desiring to overthrow the perfect Bible. So, other than commenting on the irony of the way in which they were found, they are largely ignored.

The translators of the King James Bible did not need the Dead Sea Scrolls since they already had the Textus Receptus which they match.

QUESTION: I've heard that there have been many manuscripts discovered since 1611 that the King James translators didn't have access to. Do these strengthen or weaken the King James Bible?

ANSWER: They strengthen the King James Bible.

EXPLANATION: There have been many manuscripts found since 1611, but there have been no new **READINGS** found.

Many critics of the Word of God have used the argument of "new evidence" that the King James translators didn't have as a basis to degrade its authority. The fact is, that the King James translators had all of the **readings** available to them that modern critics have available to them today.

One of the most prominent manuscripts which has been discovered since 1611 is the Sinaitic manuscript. This witness, though horribly flawed, was found amongst trash paper in St. Catherine's monastery at the foot of Mt. Sinai in 1841 by Constantine Tischendorf.

Sinaiticus is a sister manuscript of the corrupt manuscript, Vaticanus. Both read very similarly. So, although the Sinaitic manuscript was discovered over 200 years after the Authorized Version was translated, its **READINGS** were well known to the translators through the Vatican manuscript which was discovered in 1481 and also through the Jesuit Bible, an English translation of 1582.

So we see that there are no readings available today to scholars which were not already in the hands of the King James translators. We might further add that an **honest** scholar will admit that this "great number of newly discovered manuscripts" that are trumped abroad, agree with the Greek text of the Authorized Version rather than challenging it.